Research Paper

Effects of Different Corrective Feedback Types on Reducing Iranian Test-takers' Speaking Anxiety: Lower- and Upper-intermediate Levels

Samin Seyedebrahimi[1], Fariba Rahimi Esfahani*[2], and Mehrdad Sepehri[3]

[1]Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord Iran
samin.seyedebrahimi@yahoo.com
[2]Assistant Professor, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord Iran
f_rahimi_e@yahoo.com
[3]Associate Professor, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord Iran
m.sepehri@iaushk.ac.ir

Abstract

The current study explored the effects of different feedback types on reducing Iranian test-takers' speaking anxiety at the lower- and upper-intermediate levels. For this purpose, 90 male and female learners aged 21 to 45, who were preparing themselves to take the IELTS Mock test, were selected through a convenient sampling method and divided into lower-intermediate and upper-intermediate levels on the basis of the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) results. Then, they underwent ten treatment sessions of recast, explicit, metalinguistic, and clarification corrective feedback. To measure the anxiety in speaking performance, Chowdhury's (2014) questionnaire was given to the participants once before treatment and once after the treatment. Then, the score of each learner was calculated and recorded for the data analysis. The obtained results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference among the feedback types regarding the participants' speaking anxiety at the lower-intermediate as well as the upper-intermediate level. The implication of this finding is that teachers should constantly implement different types of corrective feedback in their classes to help students with their speaking anxiety problems.

Keywords: *Feedback, Explicit Correction, Speaking Anxiety*

<div dir="rtl">

تأثیر انواع مختلف بازخورد اصلاحی بر کاهش اضطراب گفتاری آزمون‌دهندگان ایرانی: سطوح پایین و فوق متوسط

مطالعه حاضر به بررسی اثرات انواع مختلف بازخورد بر کاهش اضطراب گفتاری آزمون‌دهندگان ایرانی در سطوح متوسط پایین و متوسط پرداخت. بدین منظور، 90 دانش‌آموز دختر و پسر 21 تا 45 ساله که خود را برای شرکت در آزمون آزمایشی آیلتس آماده می‌کردند، به روش نمونه‌گیری در دسترس انتخاب و بر اساس آزمون آکسفورد به سطوح متوسط پایین و متوسط تقسیم شدند. نتایج آزمون قرار دادن (OPT). سپس، آنها تحت 10 جلسه درمانی بازخورد اصلاحی، صریح، فرازبانی و شفاف سازی قرار گرفتند. برای سنجش اضطراب در عملکرد گفتاری، پرسشنامه چاودری (2014) یک بار قبل از درمان و یک بار بعد از درمان به شرکت کنندگان داده شد. سپس امتیاز هر فراگیر محاسبه و برای تجزیه و تحلیل داده ها ثبت شد. نتایج به‌دست‌آمده نشان داد که بین انواع بازخورد در رابطه با اضطراب گفتاری شرکت‌کنندگان در سطح متوسط‌پایین و متوسط‌بالا تفاوت آماری معناداری وجود دارد. مفهوم این یافته این است که معلمان باید به طور مداوم انواع مختلف بازخوردهای اصلاحی را در کلاس های خود اجرا کنند تا به دانش آموزان در مشکلات اضطراب گفتاری کمک کنند.

واژگان کلیدی: بازخورد، تصحیح صریح، اضطراب گفتاری

</div>

Introduction

Feedback is information provided for learners pertaining to some aspects of their performance on a task Brandet (2008). Brandet (2008) argues that this information can be provided to learners by the teacher and peers. He further claims that there should exist a balance in the authenticity of feedback provided to learners. However, he adds the flow of feedback from the teacher and peers makes the learner feel uncomfortable, thereby contributing to learners believing the use of corrective feedback to dwindle as the course continues.

In an analysis of teacher-student interaction, Tsang (2004) contends that pushing the learners towards modifying the output than providing them with feedback is of use to them in developing their interlanguage. As he maintains uptake and repair rates underrate that of feedback and Negotiation, i.e., elicitation, clarification request, 'metalinguistic' feedback, and repetition contribute to a higher degree of repair than recasts and explicit feedback. According to Tatawy (2001), corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback are three terms used in the fields of language teaching, language acquisition, and cognitive psychology respectively. The feedback can be either explicit, like a grammatical explanation and explicit correction of an error, or implicit, like silence, asking for repetition, recast clarification request, and facial (Tatawy, 2001). Interest in the impact of corrective feedback on foreign language development and in the roles of both teachers and students in corrective feedback has ignited a considerable number of studies recently done on the relationship between corrective feedback and L2 development.

Harlen and Winter (2004) discuss the positive contribution of feedback to learning. As they maintain, feedback influences learners in two ways: "their perceived success or failure in comparison with others in previous tasks similar to the one they are now faced with; and the kind of feedback they receive from their teacher" (p. 400). Both of these are contingent upon how teachers react to learners' work, whether orally or in written form.

According to Ellis (2005), the corrective feedback which is provided by the teacher or, to a lower degree, by students is research-worthy in as much as there is the claim that learning a second language entails negative as well as positive evidence. Corrective feedback may help language learners with the linguistic forms that might be ignored and identify the deviant linguistic productions (Ellis, 2005). As Ellis (2005) adds, corrective feedback ten hypothesized to have a significant contribution to developing accuracy in the second language.

Types of Corrective Feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997, cited in Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013) identified six types of corrective feedback which are classified into two categories of reformulation and prompt. Reformulations comprise explicit correction and recast, as these moves provide language learners with "target reformulations of their non-target output" (p. 3). Prompts, on the other hand, include such signals as elicitation, metalinguistic clues, repetition, and clarification request, pushing language learners towards self-repair. Corrective feedback is also classified as implicit and explicit regarding the directness of the correction made by the teacher.

Furthermore, Ellis and Sheen (2006, cited in Lyster et al., 2013) have their own vein of classification of corrective feedback. They distinguish between explicit corrective feedback, which provides learners with the correct form of what they have linguistically produced, such as what is done in didactic recasts, and explicit correction, and the explicit correction where the correct form is withheld, such as what is done in elicitation and metalinguistic clues.

Yilmaz (2016) also has his own vein of division. He broaches the term feedback exposure condition, which refers to whether a language learner's exposure to corrective feedback is direct or indirect. He considers direct corrective feedback to be the feedback that a language learner is

provided with on his or her incorrect utterance and indirect corrective feedback as the corrective feedback provided for other learners and he or she is allowed to listen to.

Review of Literature

Rassaei (2015) investigated the extent to which learners with high and low foreign language (FL) anxiety benefit from recasts and metalinguistic corrective feedback. In his study, 101 EFL learners were first classified into high- and low-anxiety learners according to scores they obtained in an anxiety questionnaire. Then, each anxiety group was further subdivided randomly into two treatment conditions that received either recasts or metalinguistic corrective feedback for their errors, as well as one control group. Three dependent measures were also used on two occasions as pre-test and post-test to investigate the effects of corrective feedback and FL anxiety on learners' development. The results indicated that low-anxiety learners benefited from both metalinguistic feedback and recasts, although the effect of metalinguistic feedback on their development was more profound. Conversely, the high-anxiety learners benefited from recasts significantly more than they did from metalinguistic corrective feedback.

Fahim and Montazeri (2013) investigated the impact of metalinguistic corrective feedback on learners' levels of lexical resource and grammatical range and accuracy in EFL learners' oral proficiency. The participants of the study included 30 EFL learners studying the books New Interchange 3 and Passages 1, divided into two learners of 15, one experimental and one control, with a lower-intermediate level of oral language proficiency. The control group, during the instruction, received no corrective feedback, while the experimental group received metalinguistic corrective feedback. Based on the results of the post-test, it was seen that the experimental group, receiving metalinguistic feedback, outperformed the control group in terms of lexical resources and accuracy in oral performance.

International Related Studies

Zhai and Gao (2018) conducted a speaking task experiment among 24 university students in China, exploring the effect of teachers' CF on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) speaking task complexity. Their findings showed that CF had different effects on EFL oral production with different task complexity. In a simple speaking task, the effects of five kinds of CF (from largest to smallest) were listed as follows: clarification quest, metalinguistic feedback, recast, repetition, and confirmation check. Regarding complex speaking tasks, the effects of five categorized CFs were ranked from largest to smallest as follows: metalinguistic feedback, confirmation check, recast, clarification request, and repetition.

Lightbown (1992, cited in Gass & Selinker, 2008) compared corrective feedback provided by teachers immediately after an error taking place in a communicative activity versus feedback on audio-lingual drills or pure practice activities. She found that in both cases, students were able to do self-correction, but only in the first case was the self-correction incorporated into the systems of their second language.

Sauro (2009) investigated the impact of two types of computer-mediated corrective feedback on the development of adult learners' L2 knowledge: corrective feedback reformulating the error in recasts form and corrective feedback supplying the learner with metalinguistic information on the nature of the error being made. High intermediate and advanced adult learners of English from an intact class at a Swedish university were randomly assigned to one of three conditions (two feedback conditions and one control) and were randomly paired with English native speakers. While engaged in task-based interaction through text chat, the learners were provided with focused corrective feedback on the omission of the zero articles with abstract non-count nouns. Learning outcomes were measured via computer-delivered pre-tests, post-tests, and delayed post-tests of knowledge. The findings showed no significant priority for either feedback

type on immediate or sustained gains in target form knowledge, whereas the metalinguistic group depicted significant immediate gains compared with the control condition.

Corbalan, Kester, and Merriënboer (2009) studied the effects of the correct response feedback and control over the selection of learning tasks. They found that the presence of knowledge correct response (KCR) feedback contributed to higher learner motivation.

Shin and Dickson (2010) examined the effect of graphical feedback and students' performance in the class on their motivation and academic performance in an online course. In their study, they applied motivation theory to contrast self- versus peer-referenced two forms of feedback. In order to present this feedback, they used graphical displays. So as to compare two types of feedback on students' achievement goal orientations, interest in the course, punctuality of assignment submission, and essay length, a cross-over experimental design was applied. Under one condition, learners first were provided with peer-referenced graphical feedback on the punctuality of their assignment submission for the first half of the course and then were given self-referenced graphical feedback on the length of their essays during the second half of the course. Under the other condition, the feedback was provided in reverse order. They found that students went more performance goal-oriented after receiving peer-referenced feedback and that they showed more interest in the course after being provided with self-referenced feedback.

Several research studies have been carried out with regard to students' anxiety in speaking. For example, Huang (2004) investigated speaking anxiety among EFL non-English university students in Taiwan and found that students experience a high level of speaking anxiety. In their large-scale research study that is carried out on 547 Chinese EFL students, Liu and Jackson (2008) concluded that students experience anxiety in speaking and foreign language anxiety is a powerful predictor of unwillingness to communicate in foreign language classes. In addition, in their qualitative study, Tsiplakides and Keramida (2009) analyzed fifteen third-grade Greek students who ranged in age from 13 to 14. They found that six students experience English language speaking anxiety due to the fear of negative evaluation from their peers and perception of low ability compared to their peers.

Dalkılıç (2001) investigated the correlation between students' foreign language anxiety levels and their achievement in speaking courses. She conducted her study on 126 Turkish freshman EFL learners and benefited from both qualitative and quantitative data. The findings of the study revealed that there was a significant relationship between the students' anxiety levels and their success in speaking classes. In addition, Ay (2010) found that students reported anxiety in an advanced level of productive skills. The participants of the study reported that their anxiety occurs most when they are required to speak without being prepared in advance.

Moreover, in his study, which focuses on the relationship between proficiency level and degree of foreign language speaking anxiety in a Turkish EFL context, Balemir (2009) revealed that Turkish EFL university students experience a moderate level of speaking anxiety in their language classes. Furthermore, Saltan (2003) investigated the EFL speaking anxiety in terms of both students' and teachers' perspectives. The findings of her study indicated that students experience a certain degree of EFL speaking anxiety, but the intensity of it is not disturbingly high.

Jang (2011) investigated whether language anxiety influenced the extent to which two corrective feedback (CF) techniques of recasts and prompts affect the L2 learning process and its outcome. Four experimental learners were formed according to their anxiety level, and the type of CF received during question recall tasks they completed: the high-anxiety recasts-receiving group, the low-anxiety recasts-receiving group, and the high-anxiety prompts-receiving group, and the low-anxiety prompts-receiving group. Two high- and low-anxiety control learners were additionally formed, who did not engage in the tasks. In Jang's (2011) study, learners' anxiety

level was judged based on their responses to a language anxiety questionnaire. CF efficacy in processing L2 was measured by examining the extent to which CF induced modified output and repair. Learners' L2 knowledge was assessed at explicit and implicit levels on pre-tests, immediate post-test, and delayed post-tests. Results revealed that language anxiety had no impact on prompts' efficacy but displayed some influence on recasts' efficacy. Recasts were more effective in promoting repair and L2 explicit knowledge for low-anxiety learners. It was also found that the differential effects of learner language anxiety were closely related to the level of anxiety aroused by the way the tasks were implemented. The finding highlights the significance of considering both learner language anxiety and task anxiety in providing CF.

Mufidah (2017) investigated the impact of oral corrective feedback (OCF) on the level of language anxiety (LA) in learners with low English proficiency by examining whether OCF gives a different impact on the learners who have a different level of LA. It was a qualitative approach that dealt with students' psychological situations occurring in natural phenomena through classroom observation by using field notes and video recording to gain valid data, as well as semi-structured interviews presented to clarify the result and get further information. The findings showed that the students from various levels of LA (VA, A, MA & R) learners claimed OCF helped them to know their mistakes easily and motivated them to study harder but not to increase their speaking performance. The study gives valuable information on how learners' errors and teachers' OCF affect learners' LA level, so the teachers can decide appropriate OCF strategy based on the level of LA. Furthermore, the students can get much more knowledge for better language achievement.

In sum, some studies have provided evidence that proficiency level affects the usefulness of feedback, indicating that the higher the participant's language level, the more they benefit from being corrected (e.g., Ammar & Spada, 2006; Dekeyser, 1993). The current study aimed to contribute to this discussion by investigating proficiency and feedback effectiveness and finding answers to the following questions.

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant difference among the effects of different feedback types on reducing Iranian test-takers' speaking anxiety at the lower-intermediate level?

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant difference among the effects of different feedback types on reducing Iranian test-takers' speaking anxiety at the upper-intermediate level?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of this study comprised 90 lower- and upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners who were selected through convenience sampling from among the learners who were taking IELTS preparation courses. They were both male and female learners within the age range of 21-45, all native speakers of Persian.

Instruments

The instruments utilized in this study were an Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and a questionnaire on anxiety in speaking performance. The Oxford Placement Test was used to measure the EFL learners' level of general English language proficiency and ensure their homogeneity. This version of the test consisted of 60 multiple-choice-item questions. The learners were required to choose the correct answer from among the alternatives in 30 minutes. Those who scored 37 to 47 were considered lower-intermediate, and those who scored 48 to 55 were considered advanced participants.

The second instrument which was utilized in this study was a speaking anxiety questionnaire developed by Chowdhury (2014). This questionnaire is a 25-item Likert-scale instrument in which each item is scored on a 5-point scale where 1=Entirely disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Not sure,

4=Agree, and 5=Entirely agree. The participants were required to choose a suitable choice based on their opinion on each item. The reliability index of the questionnaire was found to be .78, using Chronbach's Alpha.

Procedure

At the beginning of the research, the OPT was administered to the IELTS learners at a language institute in Tehran, Iran. The level of the IELTS test takers was determined through the guidelines of the OPT, focusing on lower-intermediate and upper-intermediate learners.

In order to measure the anxiety in the participants' speaking performance, Chowdhury's (2014) questionnaire was given to the participants once before treatment and once after the treatment. Then, the score of each learner was calculated and recorded for the data analysis.

There were ten treatment sessions in which the teacher corrected the mistakes of the student's using reformulation whenever she faced any problems on the part of students; for example, when someone said, "I agree with you," she continued and said, "oh, you agree with me." She did not ask the students to think back on what they had just said, nor did she tell them they had made a mistake.

Results

Before presenting the results of the research for the posed research questions, the results of the language placement test (OPT) are shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1

The Result of the OPT for the Upper-Intermediate Learners

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Upper	45	37.00	47.00	42.75	2.99
Valid N (listwise)	45				

Table 1 shows the results of the OPT scores. The mean and standard deviation scores for the upper-intermediate learners are 42.75 and 2.99, respectively. In the next steps, the research questions are answered.

Table 2

The Result of the ANCOVA for the Comparison of the Feedback Types at the Upper-Intermediate level

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	449.063[a]	4	112.266	150.912	.000	.945
Intercept	.172	1	.172	.231	.634	.007
Prescores1	42.963	1	42.963	57.753	.000	.623
Group1	210.094	3	70.031	94.139	.000	.890
Error	26.037	35	.744			
Total	155976.000	40				
Corrected Total	475.100	39				

As Table 2 above shows, there was a statistically significant difference among the feedback types regarding the speaking anxiety at the upper-intermediate level (F, 3,35 = 94.13, p < .05, partial η^2 = .89). The related descriptive statistics are shown below.

Table 3

The Descriptive Statistics for the Feedback Types at the Upper-Intermediate level

Group1	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Metalinguistic	59.756[a]	.282	59.183	60.329
Clarification-R	63.244[a]	.274	62.689	63.800
Recast	60.167[a]	.280	59.599	60.735
Explicit	66.233[a]	.296	65.633	66.833

As is seen, the lowest anxiety scores for different types of feedback are: metalinguistic feedback (59.75), recast (60.16), clarification request (63.24), and explicit group (66.23). The table below shows the Pairwise comparison.

Table 4

The Result of the Pairwise Comparison of the Feedback Types at the Upper-Intermediate level

(I) Group1	(J) Group1	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[b]
Metalinguistic	Clarification-R	-3.488*	.397	.000
	Recast	-.411	.386	**1.000**
	Explicit	-6.477*	.429	.000
Clarification-R	Metalinguistic	3.488*	.397	.000
	Recast	3.077*	.394	.000
	Explicit	-2.988*	.397	.000
Recast	Metalinguistic	.411	.386	**1.000**
	Clarification-R	-3.077*	.394	.000
	Explicit	-6.066*	.424	.000
Explicit	Metalinguistic	6.477*	.429	.000
	Clarification-R	2.988*	.397	.000
	Recast	6.066*	.424	.000

As is shown in the above table, at the upper-intermediate level, except for the metalinguistic and recast learners, there was a statistically significant difference between and among the rest of the feedback types (P < .05).

Table 5

The Result of the ANCOVA for the Comparison of the Feedback Types at the Lower-Intermediate level

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	282.937[a]	4	70.734	189.513	.000	.956
Intercept	5.020	1	5.020	13.451	.001	.278

Prescores1	10.137	1	10.137	27.158	.000	.437
Group1	**140.391**	**3**	**46.797**	**125.380**	**.000**	**.915**
Error	13.063	35	.373			
Total	169296.000	40				
Corrected Total	296.000	39				

As Table 5 shows, there was a statistically significant difference among the feedback types regarding the participants' speaking anxiety scores (F, 3,35 = 125.38, p < .05, partial η^2 = .91.) The related descriptive statistics are shown below.

Table 6
The Descriptive Statistics for the Feedback Types at the Lower-Intermediate

	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
Group1			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Metalinguistic	62.613[a]	.209	62.189	63.037
Clarification-R	65.917[a]	.194	65.524	66.311
Recast	63.193[a]	.197	62.793	63.592
Explicit	68.277[a]	.218	67.835	68.719

As seen in the above table, the lowest anxiety scores for different types of feedback are: metalinguistic feedback (62.61), recast (63.19), clarification request (65.19), and explicit group (68.27). The table below shows the Pairwise comparison.

Table 7
The Result of the Pairwise Comparison of the Feedback Types at the Lower-Intermediate level

(I) Group1	(J) Group1	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[b]
Metalinguistic	Clarification-R	-3.304[*]	.289	.000
	Recast	-.580	.276	.260
	Explicit	-5.663[*]	.327	.000
Clarification-R	Metalinguistic	3.304[*]	.289	.000
	Recast	2.725[*]	.278	.000
	Explicit	-2.359[*]	.286	.000
Recast	Metalinguistic	.580	.276	.260
	Clarification-R	-2.725[*]	.278	.000
	Explicit	-5.084[*]	.306	.000
Explicit	Metalinguistic	5.663[*]	.327	.000
	Clarification-R	2.359[*]	.286	.000
	Recast	5.084[*]	.306	.000

As it is seen, at the lower-intermediate level, there is a statistically significant difference between the metalinguistic and clarification learners (P < .05), the metalinguistic and explicit

learners (P < .05), the clarification and recast learners (P < .05), between the clarification and explicit learners (P < .05), and between the recast and explicit learners (P < .05).

Discussion

The results obtained for research question one shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the types of feedback related to the anxiety scores spoken by learners. At the lower-intermediate level, there is a statistically significant difference between meta-linguistic and taxonomic learners, lexical-linguistic and taxonomic learners, descriptive and reconstructed learners, descriptive and categorical learners, and reconstructed and categorical learners.

The results obtained for research question two revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in the types of feedback related to the anxiety scores spoken by learners at the upper-intermediate level. In other words, at the upper-intermediate level, there is a statistically significant difference between the types of feedback other than metallurgical and reconstructed learners.

In metalinguistic feedback, where teachers describe problems using grammar or other linguistic terminology, students pay less attention to responding to or expressing themselves. Restoring as an indirect corrective feedback type, telling the teacher the correct version of the student's mispronunciation without further comment can also have a beneficial effect in reducing participants' anxiety. Similarly, clarification requests, asking teachers for clarification of meaning by indirectly asking learners to be more precise and clearer, have proven to be a practical way to reduce speech anxiety levels.

With the exception of the obvious improvement that did not have a statistically significant effect on reducing speech anxiety, the remaining types of feedback were found to have valuable results. However, this does not mean that only the four studied in the current research can be applied in the language classroom. The approach used by teachers plays an undeniable role in achieving the desired effect. As Zarinabadi (2014) suggests, frequency and direction provided by teachers or colleagues may change them in terms of time and support.

As mentioned earlier, all types of corrective feedback except the obvious correction showed a significant reduction in the levels of anxiety expressed by the participants. For the lower-intermediate and upper-intermediate levels, the lowest anxiety scores were for metalinguistic feedback, recast, clarification request, and clear correction, respectively. In IELTS pre-advanced classes, learners' errors need to be corrected for their accuracy, which proves to be more beneficial given the opportunity through metalinguistic, recast, and clarification requests. Therefore, IELTS teachers should be careful to select the appropriate corrective feedback type based on the needs of their learners. The metalinguistic corrective feedback, which uses a less direct way of correcting learners' erroneous outputs when speaking, can also be carefully claimed as being more psychologically designed to test learners' language hypotheses. It depends on what they have created in their own language and is transmitted by them. (Montagere & Salimi, 2019).

Unlike advanced-level students who experienced a significant reduction in their spoken anxiety levels, upper-intermediate students did not benefit from the corrective feedback types, nor in retrospective training or explicit type. The results of this study are in line with those of Iwashita (2003), who found that positive evidence and feedback work better for learners with higher scores. The results of Ammer & Spada (2006) also support the results of this study. They found that highly skilled learners benefited only from all kinds of corrective feedback and suggestions, while less skilled learners benefited more from instruction. Similarly, Philip (2003) and Trofimovich et al. (2007) found that high-skilled learners often viewed feedback and benefited more from corrective feedback from teachers. Ammer (2008)'s research supports the results of the current study, which found that learners benefit more from feedback if they are at a higher stage of development. The justification for the difference between the two levels of results

is that the higher-level students are more academically motivated or mentally mature in terms of accepting and accepting feedback; He believes his teachers' reforms are making him learn better. The results of the study were in stark contrast to Mufidah (2017), who found that language learners at different levels of correctional feedback in their study helped to easily identify their mistakes and learn more effectively.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that each feedback is not necessarily conducive to better speech performance, as the context in which students are corrected is just as important as the context in which they develop. These results may not be applicable to everyone learning English in courses other than IELTS. While the intent or motivation that IELTS learners pursue is very different from that of English learners in long-term institutions, their linguistic focus may differ in the sense they learn a second language on a daily, non-academic basis. Therefore, it can be argued that the speaking performance of IELTS learners is somewhat related to the type of feedback they receive and how well their teachers correct them.

Some implications can be drawn from the evidence of the present study. First, it was found that in the upper-intermediate classes, in contrast to the lower-intermediate level, language teachers distinguished speaking classes on the basis of their skill level, with no statistically significant difference in the form of speech anxiety. This will lead to better performance of the learners in the long run. Second, because clear and reconstructed corrective feedbacks are beneficial in reducing speech anxiety levels, teachers encourage students to focus on improvements made directly or indirectly. Third, teachers are advised to consistently implement a variety of corrective responses in their classrooms to help students with their speech barriers. However, care should be taken not to overuse the feedback as it can have adverse effects.

References

Ammar, A. (2008). Prompts and recasts Differential effects on second language morphosyntax. *RELC Journal*,*12*(2), 183-210.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). Does one size fit all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 543-574.

Basic, L. (2011). Speaking anxiety: An obstacle to second language learning? University of Gavle. *Faculty of Education and Business Studies*, 11, 1-25.

Chowdhury, S. (2014). Learner's foreign language speaking anxiety: A tertiary level scenario in an EFL class. A thesis submitted to the department of English and Humanities of BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Dekeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal, 77*(4), 501-514.

Ellis, R. (2005). Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review. Auckland: Research Division.

Ellis, R. (2005). Planning and task-based performance: Theory and research. In R. Ellis (Ed), Planning and task performance. (pp.3-36). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gregersen, T, & Horwitz, EK. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: anxious and non-anxious. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 562–570.

Gregersen, T, Macintyre, PD, Meza, MD. (2014). The motion of emotion: idiodynamic case studies of learners' foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(2), 574–588.

Hamidi, H. (2015). Research in applied linguistics. Retrieved from http:// www. iranelt. com/ index.php/introduction-to-research-methods.

Irzeqat, N. (2010). *The effect of anxiety on the oral performance of Palestinian students of English from the perspectives of teachers and students* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Hebron University.

Kozlova, I. (2010). Reader's response to Ellis's corrective feedback in a problem-solving context. *ELT Journal, 64*(1), 95-98.

Lin, Y-H., &Hedgcock, J. (1996). Negative feedback incorporation among High-proficiency, low-proficiency Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish. *Language Learning, 46*(4), 567-611.

London, M., & Sessa, V. I. (2009). Group feedback for continuous learning. *Human Resource Development Review, 5*(3), 303-329.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake. *SSLA, 20*(3), 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language teaching, 46*(1), 1-40.DOI:10.1017/S0261444812000365

Mufidah, Z. M. (2017). The impact of oral corrective feedback on the level of language anxiety. Advances in Social Science, *Education and Humanities Research*, 145, 219-227. http://dx.doi.org/10.2991/iconelt-17.2018.48

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6,186-214.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake across educational settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 263-300.

Trofimovich, P., Ammar, A., &Gatbonton, E. (2007). How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytical ability. In A. Mackey (Ed.) Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies (pp. 171–195). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Yilmaz, Y. (2016). The role of exposure condition in the effectiveness of explicit correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 38*(1), 65-96.

Young, DJ. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: what does language anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 426–439. https:/doi.Org/10. 1111/j.1540-4781. 1991.tb05378.x.

Zarrinabadi, N. (2014). Communicating in the second language: Investigating the effect of the teacher on learners' willingness to communicate. *System, 42*(1), 288-295.

Zhai, K., & Gao, X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education*, 5, 1-13.

Zohrabi, M., Farrokhi, F., & Chehrazad, M. (2017). The effect of the corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' speaking accuracy and breakdown fluency. *Journal of Language Horizons, 6*(1), 107-129.